

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 875

EA 020 222

AUTHOR Arter, Judith A.  
 TITLE Assessing Leadership and Managerial Behavior. A Consumer's Guide.  
 INSTITUTION Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.  
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.  
 PUB DATE Mar 88  
 CONTRACT 400-86-0006  
 NOTE 70p.  
 PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Administrator Characteristics; \*Administrator Effectiveness; Elementary Secondary Education; \*Leadership; \*Leadership Styles; \*Measurement Techniques; \*Principals; School Effectiveness  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Effective Schools Research

## ABSTRACT

This guide provides summaries and analyses of various measures related to school leadership and administrator skills, behavior styles, and characteristics. The guide aims to help schools, districts, and other educational organizations examine their leadership effectiveness. While principals are stressed, some information is provided about teachers, students, and superintendents. Intended for use by practitioners, the guide briefly discusses leadership assessment issues, reviews over 40 assessment tools, and discusses the importance of examining school leadership. It next explores definitional and measurement issues, comments on the current state-of-the-art, and explains how to select a leadership measure. Of the 15 published instruments reviewed, only four were developed specifically for use in education. Almost all the research, undocumented, and state instruments focus on educational settings. Most of the general business instruments focus on leadership styles, while education instruments stress specific skills, behaviors, and traits viewed as important for principals. Most instruments are self-report surveys designed for self-assessment or training sessions and are easy to use. Appendix A contains 13 long and 2 short reviews of all published instruments and commercially available procedures. Appendix B provides 11 short reviews of research instruments. Appendix C briefly reviews 11 instruments lacking supporting technical information. Three additional appendices provide an outline of state activities and resources, a summary table of leadership instruments, and a checklist for selecting a leadership measure. An index is also included. (MLH)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

## A CONSUMER'S GUIDE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it  
 Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Jerry A.  
Kirkpatrick*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

## Assessing Leadership and Managerial Behavior

by

Judith A. Arter

March 1988

Sponsored by **OERI** Office of Educational  
Research and Improvement  
U.S. Department of Education



Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory  
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500  
Portland, Oregon 97204



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# **ASSESSING LEADERSHIP AND MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOR**

## **A CONSUMER'S GUIDE**

**By**

**Judith A. Arter**

**March, 1988**

**Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory  
101 S.W. Main, Suite 500  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
(503) 275-9500**

**March 1988**

This guide is published by the Test Center of the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, a private nonprofit corporation. The work contained herein has been developed under Contract 400-86-0006 for the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Education Department. The opinions expressed in this guide do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI and no official endorsement by the office should be inferred.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Purpose of This Guide.....	1
2. The Importance of Looking at School Leadership.....	1
3. Definitional Issues .....	2
4. Measurement Issues .....	4
5. State-of-the-Art .....	5
6. How To Select A Measure Of Leadership.....	7
 <b>References</b> .....	 9
 <b>Appendix A Long Reviews of Published Instruments and Procedures .....</b>	 11
Instruments and Procedures Designed for Educational Settings .....	13
Instruments and Procedures Designed for General Business and Industry .....	23
 <b>Appendix B Research Instruments -- Short Reviews.....</b>	 45
 <b>Appendix C Undocumented Instruments -- Short Reviews.....</b>	 51
 <b>Appendix D State Activities and Resources .....</b>	 57
 <b>Appendix E Summary Table of Leadership Instruments.....</b>	 63
 <b>Appendix F Checklist for Selecting a Measure of Leadership.....</b>	 73
 <b>Index</b> .....	 79

## **1. Purpose of This Guide**

One of the areas emphasized in the effective schools literature is school leadership. Leadership is presented as being essential for school effectiveness and efficiency. This Guide provides summaries and analysis of various measures that relate to leadership and administrative skills, behaviors, styles and characteristics. The purpose is to provide a resource to schools, districts and other educational organizations who wish to examine the effectiveness of their leadership. Although the emphasis is on principals, there is also some information presented about superintendents, teachers and students.

This Guide is intended for use by practitioners. It is intended to provide the information necessary for users to become more informed consumers of assessment tools which attempt to measure leadership. Included in the Guide are a brief discussion of the issues in assessing leadership, reviews of over 40 assessment tools, and discussion of the importance of looking at school leadership, definitions, how to select a measure of leadership, and the state-of-the-art in assessing this area. We do not advocate any leadership theory; we attempt, rather, to describe and evaluate what is available.

## **2. The Importance of Looking at School Leadership**

A long history of research on leadership has resulted in many theories of what leadership is and what characteristics, traits and behaviors are associated with effective leadership. It has also demonstrated the general effect of leadership on the success of organizations.

However, this body of research has also established that leadership is a complex and ambiguous phenomenon and doesn't lend itself to simple definitions or statements of what conception of leadership is best. This complexity is reflected in research on leadership in educational settings.

Many sources cite school leadership as one of the contributing factors to having an effective school (e.g., Robinson, 1982; Murphy et. al., 1985; Rowan and Denk, 1984; OERI, 1987; Sashkin and Huddle, n.d.). Many of the studies cited appear to be correlational in nature -- the researchers pick schools that have higher and lower achievement than expected (based on their student population, etc.) and then look to see what is different about them. The characteristics of leaders in these situations tend to be different in terms of vision, climate, etc.

There are relatively fewer studies which directly examine the impact of the school principal on outcomes such as student achievement, staff morale, absenteeism and school climate. Such studies could do things such as changing the behavior of the leader to see what changes in outcomes result, looking at various types of schools not just inner city schools, and looking at schools who are trying to improve (Pitner and Charter, 1984). A few studies have attempted to do this -- for example, Rowan and Denk (1984) who examined how changing principals affects achievement; and Robinson and Block (1982) who report on two studies which looked at the impact on a program's outcomes when the principal alternately spent more and less personal time working with the program. The general lack of such studies has, however, prompted several authors to say that research has yet to determine the specific effect of leadership on the organization (Coleman, 1981; Pitner and Charter, 1984).

One problem in trying to prove the effect that principals have on student and other educational outcomes, has appeared to be that what may constitute effective leadership in one situation may not be effective in another. The situational nature of leadership has made it very difficult to specify any single profile of skills, traits and style that is best at all times (Pitner and Hocevar, 1987; Duke, 1982; Pitner, 1986; Coleman, 1981).

Some examples of situational features that could affect the effectiveness of leadership are the educational background and professional orientation of subordinates, how much control administrators have over reward structures, how intrinsically satisfying the job is, and how flexible the organization is (Yukl, 1981). Since principals do not typically have control over such things as monetary rewards to teachers, since school organizations are not flexible, and since the teaching task (for example, watching students learn) seems to be intrinsically motivating to teachers, there are some authors who feel that even the potential effect of principals is greatly reduced (Pitner, 1986).

Thus, at this time, it has generally been established that leadership characteristics are important for success in educational settings. There is also a great deal of anecdotal and research information about successful approaches. However, there are no final answers about what characteristics are most important, what the relative impact of leadership is when compared to other school factors, or how the most effective leadership might vary between situations. These are sources of continuing research.

### 3. Definitional Issues

Because of the complexity of leadership, definitions and conceptions of leadership differ. These differences are reflected in both training packages and assessment tools. Pitner and Charter (1984), for example, present a variety of definitions that various authors have proposed -- "Leadership theory has stumbled through the trait, behavioral, and situational approaches and the images of leader as orchestra conductor, quarterback, prince, hero, superman, spiny creature and the Wizard of Oz" (p. 8). They conclude that there are two assumptions apparent in most definitions -- "(1) leadership is a group phenomenon involving the interaction between two or more persons, and (2) it involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leader over followers." Some issues that affect definition are:

1. **Leadership v. Management.** Muth (1987) feels that current definitions of leadership and lists of skills for leaders confuse leadership with administrative and management skills. He feels that leadership should be a specialized term that refers only to the earning of respect and loyalty through vision, values and charisma. He further feels that good school functioning may not require "leaders" but only good managers. Others feel that leadership, especially instructional leadership is essential. DeBevoise (1984) defines instructional leadership as "those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others to promote growth in student learning."

For purposes of this Guide we will include all skills, behaviors and traits that may be related to effectiveness regardless of whether they may be better labeled "leadership" or "management." We will use the term leadership to describe all these areas. If we use the more restrictive definition of leadership we will put "leadership" in quotes.

2. **One Dimension, Two Dimensions or Many Dimensions?** When developing theories of leadership, researchers attempt to find out the "stuff" of which it is made -- on what "dimensions"\*\* people are the same and different. Many people have supported a

---

\*Please note that dimension is a statistical term. It is not to be confused with merely a list of skills. Skills can be dependent -- if one is good in one skill area they are probably also good in another. Dimension implies independence -- skill in one area has nothing to do with skill in another. Therefore, dimension is the basic way people can differ from each other. Many skills or abilities can contribute to a dimension.

two-dimensional view of leadership (for example, Blake and Mouton, 1961; Fiedler, 1967). One popular theory, for example, describes the dimensions as task-orientation (concern about completing tasks) and person-orientation (concern about good interpersonal relationships). Such a theory means that all the important distinctions between leaders can be described on these two dimensions. Also, people can score high on both dimensions, low on both dimensions, or high on one and low on the other. The people who like the 2-dimensional theory imply that the best leaders score high on both dimensions.

Other authors (for example, Pitner and Hocevar, 1987) feel that there are many dimensions of leadership and that these are independent -- a person can score high in some areas and low in others. Some of these dimensions include showing consideration, inspiring subordinates, goal setting, delegating responsibility, planning, problem solving, and facilitating interaction.

The dimensionality of leadership has not been resolved. The dimensionality probably changes depending on whether one's definition of leadership includes management. For purposes of this Guide, we will merely report on the dimensions claimed by various instruments and the extent to which there is support for the claims.

3. **Function, Style or Traits.** There appear to be three different ways to describe leadership. Description by functions tend to include both management and "leadership." They list everything that a principal must do -- for example, staff development, instructional support, resource acquisition, coordination, hiring and supervision. If leadership is described by what needs to be done, then assessing leadership boils down to seeing how well the leader does those tasks.

Description by style and traits tend to be more personality oriented. There are various theories of leadership styles each of which presents different dimensions and descriptions. For example:

- (a) Task-orientation v. personal-orientation discussed above.
- (b) "Theory X v. Theory Y." Theory X people view mankind as untrustworthy and lazy while Theory Y people view mankind as trustworthy and inherently motivated.
- (c) Leaders who are directive or supportive; achievement oriented or participative.

One's style has implications for how one would go about getting things done. Presumably, certain styles would be more effective in some settings and other styles more effective in other settings.

Traits are also personality oriented but they seem to be different from styles. Traits include things such as motivation, self-confidence, tolerance for ambiguity, stress tolerance and values. These are descriptive of the personality and behavior of the leader. Presumably, these characteristics would affect how effective a leader is in various settings.

In this Guide we are including measures of all of the above because they all have implications for how a principal would carry out responsibilities. Functions represent actual tasks; styles and traits may determine effectiveness in carrying out functions.

#### **4. Measurement Issues**

Measurement issues include how well assessment instruments are designed, what are the most effective ways to get reliable information about leaders; and whether it is possible to get a real measurement of school leadership.

##### **General Instruments v. Instruments Designed For Use in Education**

There are two types of instruments and procedures for assessing leadership that are presented in this Guide -- instruments that were developed with a general focus (that is, developed for use in a variety of business and industrial settings) and instruments that were designed primarily for use in educational settings.

The instruments designed for use in education typically cover a variety of functions and traits that are proposed as being important for a principal. The instruments designed for general use typically cover leadership style.

Because effective leadership is probably situational (that is, the most effective profile of leader style and traits depends on the setting), there is some question as to how useful general instruments are for education. For example, Pitner and Hocevar (1987) had to eliminate 9 of the 23 scales on the Management Behavior Survey because they did not apply in the educational setting they examined.

In this Guide, we review all instruments with respect to their application in education. For example, are validity studies carried out in educational settings, is there assistance with how obtained profiles relate to effectiveness as a principal, and have reliabilities been computed on educational administrators? If an instrument does not have explicit information on how results are applied in educational settings, we do not recommend its use for any formal assessment activities in education such as principal selection or promotion. However, such instruments may still be interesting for use in informal self-assessment.

##### **Validity**

There are a series of validity studies that should be conducted on instruments if they are to be used for any formal purpose such as staff development, advancement, and personnel selection. The more important the decisions that will be made based on the results, the more careful should be the validation process. An ideal list of validation studies is presented in Appendix F. Some of these are:

1. How easy is it to "fake good?" Is it harder to fake good on performance tasks, interviews and general personality tests than on self-report measures? Does the instrument provide evidence that people cannot "fake good" or that procedures minimize the chances of "faking good?"
2. Is the instrument based on theory? There should be theoretical underpinnings for instruments. This provides the basis for determining what relationships should be observed with other criteria, as well as for interpreting the results.
3. If the instrument claims to measure various "dimensions" of leadership, have they done a factor analysis to show that it does?

4. How does the instrument relate to other measures of the same construct? How well does it predict future performance?
5. How do various profiles relate to outcomes such as staff morale, school climate, student achievement, absenteeism, etc? What pattern of scores should a person exhibit on the instrument?

#### **Format**

Can valid and complete information be gathered in a self-report or paper and pencil format? Or, is performance required? Only certain kinds of information can be gathered with a paper and pencil instrument. The question is whether enough information is captured to predict future performance.

#### **Atomistic v. Holistic**

Many of the instruments present lists of skills and traits that an effective principal should have. There are some people (for example, MacDougall and Estler, 1987), however, who feel that skills are not independent things that are applied one after the other, but rather represent a network. We have encountered this issue before, for example, in reading instruction. Do we assess skills or use a more holistic approach? Individual skills are useless if they cannot be used together to successfully complete a task.

### **5. State-of-the-Art**

In the appendices to this Guide we have reviewed over 35 assessment tools for looking at school leadership. These are divided into three sections:

1. There are long reviews of all published instruments and commercially available procedures. There are 13 long reviews and 2 short reviews in Appendix A.
2. There are short reviews of research instruments. These are instruments with the following characteristics: use in one or more research studies, the original purpose of the instrument is research not for general use in the schools, there is technical information available, the instrument is included in the report referenced, and the report is easily accessible. There are 11 such instruments reviewed in Appendix B.
3. There are short reviews of instruments which come with no supporting technical information. These instruments are sometimes intended for use in the schools, the instrument is included in the report referenced and the report is easily accessible. There are 11 such instruments reviewed in Appendix C.

After reviewing these instruments there are several things that can be said about the current state-of-the-art.

#### **Focus on Education**

Of the 15 published instruments and tools reviewed, only four were developed specifically for use in education. The remaining instruments were developed for general use in business and industry. Almost all of the research instruments, undocumented instruments and state

instruments, however, have a specific focus on educational settings. Thus, it appears that publishers have focused on the general business market.

### **Functions, Styles or Traits**

Most of the general business instruments focus on "leadership" styles. Most of the education specific instruments focus on specific skills, behaviors and traits thought to be important for success as a principal. Two of the instruments are actually general measures of personality. Special guides have been written for them on how to interpret the personality traits discovered with respect to leadership style or ability.

### **Content**

There are broad differences on what is covered by these instruments. Content ranges from personality, to style, to humanistic leadership to lists of functions.

Even within instruments having the same focus, such as instruments measuring leadership functions, what is covered can be different. For example one instrument might cover instructional leadership, personal warmth and managerial effectiveness and another might cover high expectations, instructional leadership, dynamism, effective use of consultation, use of time and ability to evaluate effectively. The assumptions about what should be covered are really quite different in many cases.

### **Atomistic v. Holistic**

The instruments and procedures reviewed tend to focus on particular lists of skills. This is especially true of the paper and pencil tests. Thus, most instruments are atomistic rather than holistic.

### **Formats**

Most of the instruments are self-report surveys. That is, the respondent indicates how he or she would act in various situations, which statements they agree with most or what they see their strengths and weaknesses as being. Some of the instruments require subordinates to rate the superior. There are a few procedures which are observations, require performance simulations or rely on interviews.

### **Reliability and Validity**

Most of the instruments were designed for use in self-assessment/training sessions. For such informal uses, less is required in terms of technical rigor. And, in fact, many of the instruments have little supporting technical information to show that they measure what they claim to measure. Some of those claiming application to educational settings do not provide technical information on the functioning of the instrument in those settings.

When information is provided, it is usually some type of factor analysis to demonstrate the dimensionality of the instrument. Sometimes authors will have looked at how well examinees can "fake good," how the instrument relates to other measures of the same construct, and how profiles on the instrument relates to outcomes. For the most part, however, this has not been done. The better tools in terms of technical rigor tend to be those that rely on performance assessment and interviews. A few self-rating forms also do a good job.

Some of the instruments state that they can be used for personnel selection as well as staff development. The more important the use of the instrument (as in personnel selection) the more careful should be the validation. There has been very little done with predictive validity -- how well results on the instrument relates to future performance. Again, the performance and interview procedures seem to be better in this regard. Most of the instruments should only be used for informal self-assessment and discussion.

#### What Profile Is Best?

With only a few exceptions, there is a general lack of assistance with interpreting results that is based on research. Although most instruments will tell you what results are good and bad most do not base these comments on any research. For example, the authors of an instrument might claim that Theory Y personality type is better than Theory X. However, they may not have determined that the instrument actually measures either Theory X or Y, and also have not determined how various profiles are related to outcomes such as student achievement, staff morale, absenteeism, school climate, etc.

Although some of the instruments do present this type of information for various business settings, there generally has been less work in educational settings. Thus, again, many of the instruments are best used informally.

#### Usability

Since most of the instruments are self-report they are easy to use. The more technically rigorous instruments tend to be harder to use because they rely on performance assessment or interviews and trained personnel have to observe and interpret the results.

#### Summary

In general, most of these instruments should only be used for such informal purposes as informal self-assessment, which is, in all fairness, the only purpose suggested by most. Many lack a study of reliability, validity and relationship to outcomes. Some of the ones with the best technical documentation were the NAASP Assessment Centers, the HRDR report based on the 16PFQ, the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and the Leader Authenticity Scale.

### 6. How To Select A Measure of Leadership

Except for the performance and interview procedures, which are administered and scored by trained personnel, we do not recommend using any of the instruments for formal personnel selection, advancement or career development. Because there seems to be no final word on the best set of styles and skills needed to be a good principal in all settings, we suggest that districts be careful even when using the performance and interview procedures for informal self-assessment. The following information on any procedure should be examined when using an instrument for any formal purpose:

1. The theoretical basis for the instrument.
2. Interrater, test-retest and internal consistency reliability. These should all be above .80.

3. There should be recommended profiles for various settings. These should be research based. There should be evidence that various profiles relate to various desirable outcomes.
4. There should be other validity information such as factor analysis results, relationship of scores to other predictors of future performance, and that the test is a measure of leadership not of ability to read, intelligence or ability to "fake good."

Appendix F contains a checklist of selection criteria. When using any procedure, remember that a test score should not be the only criteria on which to make important decisions. It is only one piece of information. Other information includes prior work record and recommendations from colleagues.

Selection criteria for informal uses can be much less stringent. Informal uses can be self-knowledge, promoting discussion and informal self-profiling. In these cases, the purpose for the informal assessment will guide you in the best assessment tool to use. Those which have follow-up activities may be the most useful.

## REFERENCES

- Blake, R. and Moulton, J. (1964) **The managerial grid.** Houston: Gulf Publishing.
- Clearinghouse on Educational Management (n.d.). Value search: Instructional management. ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.
- Coleman, D.G. (1981). Leader style assessment. Paper presented to the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration. Also in ERIC ED 202 150.
- De Bevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. **Educational Leadership**, February, 1984, 14-20.
- Duke, D. (1982). What can principals do? Leadership functions and instructional effectiveness. **NAASP Bulletin**, 66, 1-12.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967), **A theory of leadership effectiveness.** New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leithwood, K.A. and Montgomery, D.J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. **Review of Educational Research**, 52, 309-339.
- MacDougall, W. and Estler, S. (1982). Political versus academic definitions: A comparison of legislatively and scholarly defined administrative competencies. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- McGregor, D. (1960). **The human side of enterprise.** New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. New directions in the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis and suggestions for improvement. In Murphy and Hallinger (eds.) **Approaches to Administrative Training**, Albany, New York: State University Press of New York, 1987.
- Murphy, J., Hallinger, P. and Peterson, K.D. (1985). Supervising and evaluating principals : Lessons from effective districts. **Educational Leadership**, October, 1982, 78-82.
- Muth, R. (1987). Leadership: A question of clarity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Fordham University, Division of Administration, Policy and Urban Education, New York, NY 10023-7478.
- Neal, K. (1982). The relationship between human communication, functional dominance and the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. ERIC ED 251 862.
- Nelson, C.W. and Smith, E.F. (1976). A frame of reference for the measurement of the institutional leadership concepts and the analysis of system states. **Human Relations**, 29, 589-606.
- Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1987). **Principal selection guide.** U.S. Department of Education.

- Pitner, N.J. (1986). Substitutes for principal leader behavior: An exploratory study. *Education Administrative Quarterly*, 22, 23-42.
- Pitner, N.J. and Charter, W.W. Jr. (1984). Principal influence on teacher behavior: Substitutes for leadership. Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. Also in ERIC ED 251 941.
- Pitner, N.J. and Hocevar, D. (1987). An empirical comparison of two-factor versus multifactor theories of principal leadership: Implications for the evaluation of school principals. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, 93-109.
- Robinson, G.E. and Block, A.W. (1982) The principal and achievement: A summary of 22 Studies. *Principal*, 53-57.
- Rowan, B. and Denk, C.E. (1984). Management succession, school socioeconomic context and basic skills achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 21, 517-537.
- Sashkin, M. and Huddle, G. (n.d.) The principal's leadership role in creating effective schools. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.
- Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

**Appendix A**

**Long Reviews of Published Instruments and Procedures**

**Instruments and Procedures Designed For  
Educational Settings**

**Title of Instrument: Administrator Perceiver Interview (1979)**

**Authors:** Selection Research, Inc.

**Description:** The API is an individually administered, structured interview composed of 70 questions. The purposes are to inform employment decisions about school administrators and to provide information for professional development. Leadership skills and functions are emphasized. There is also a Principal Perceiver Instrument.

**Authors' Description of Subtests (Themes):**

1. **Mission** Mission is represented by one's personal commitment to make an affirmative impact on the lives of others. This administrator believes staff members can grow and develop. This person is primarily concerned with a cause that can be of benefit to others.
2. **Human Resources Development** Human resources development is indicated by the administrator's ability to receive satisfaction from the personal and professional growth of staff members. This person helps staff members experience success and finds fulfillment in the achievement of each person's goals.
3. **Relator** The relator theme is evident when the administrator desires positive personal relationships with others and has strategies to build relationships with the staff. This manager is committed to an extended and enduring relationship of mutual support.
4. **Delegator** A delegator wants to know each teacher's strengths and interests in order to extend responsibilities in a way which helps each teacher grow and be successful. This person begins with the individual and moves to the task or area of responsibility.
5. **Arranger** An arranger demonstrates insights and skills in working with groups of people in order to achieve common objectives. This person understands the uniqueness of individuals and helps people to work together effectively and openly.
6. **Catalyzer** The catalyzer is a manager who can stimulate the performance of teachers through searching out and encouraging the creative and innovative ideas of teachers. This person is open with personal ideas and builds enthusiasm about positive changes.
7. **Audience Sensitivity** A audience sensitive administrator spontaneously assesses the thoughts, feelings, proposed actions, and actions from the view-point of patrons, faculty and students. This person remains sensitive to this awareness and uses such insight in the decision-making process.

8. Group Enhancer      Group enhancers believe their particular staff has great potential. This person looks for the strengths in individual staff members and has a positive perspective toward them. This administrator builds pride through the accomplishments of staff and plans ways to maintain a supportive group climate.
9. Discriminator      The discriminator is an administrator who differentiates according to a well-defined value system which focuses on the worth and dignity of human beings...especially students. This person is characterized by an ability to identify that the most important aspect of a school is what happens between teachers and individual students.
10. Performance Orientation      The performance orientation theme is observed in an administrator who is goal directed. This person's goals are stated in terms of specific "practical" outcomes for self and others. This person uses criteria for measurements, has definite objectives, and is interested in measurable results.
11. Work Orientation      A administrator with work orientation is intensely involved in work and is almost continuously thinking about it. This person tends to rehearse and review activities related to work, family, and special interest commitments. Such an administrator has a life style which integrates these areas of priority into his/her actualization. This person possesses a great deal of stamina and ordinarily is actively involved for long days and weeks.
12. Ambiguity Tolerance      This administrator displays a tendency to suspend judgment until as much evidence as possible is available from involved parties. A high tolerance for ambiguity is seen as a means to an end rather than an end in itself. Much restraint is placed upon impulsive decision making.
13. Leader      A person strong in this theme enjoys being the leader. He/she likes being in a position of influence and can handle being "out front." This person is persuasive when necessary and demonstrates persistence and courage in the face of resistance. A person strong in this theme tends to be competitive and is emotionally and verbally powerful in driving toward an objective.
14. Gestalt      The person strong in this theme has a drive toward completeness, and tends toward perfectionism. Even though form and structure are important, the individual person is considered first. This administrator works from individual to structure and helps others develop their own need for completeness.

**Score Interpretation:** Although the API is scored by the 14 "themes" listed above, the authors recommend that they be used only as conceptual areas by which to organize responses, not as separate "subtests." They note that only the total score would be used

to predict future behavior of the examinee. Criteria by which the items are scored are based on responses of an unspecified number of administrators nominated as being "outstanding" by their peers. Interviewers listen for congruence of the response of the person being interviewed to those given by the "outstanding" group. "Interpretation of the API is restricted to estimating the probability that the interviewee will develop a positive relationship with teachers and other job related characteristics. The API does not assess the interviewee's knowledge of subject matter or management theory."

**Reliability:** Interrater reliability is part of the training process for interviewers. Across 20 interviews, the trainee must have an 85% agreement in scores on items in order to be certified. There is no mention of stability of these agreements over time. The internal consistency reliability of the total score based on 577 interviews is .83. These reliabilities are good.

**Validity:** The content of the instrument was "based on a series of research studies." The current edition is the fourth revision. There is some discussion of the studies that lead to the revision and what the revisions were. Items were kept only if the responses of the exemplary group of administrators used for standard setting gave consistent responses. "Standard test analysis" was also used. Additional studies will be available in 1988.

Various versions of the API have been examined for relationship with teacher ratings. Although the procedure for gathering teacher ratings is not specified, there was a good deal of agreement between such ratings and API scores over 3 repetitions. The relationship of total score to the Organizational Climate Development Questionnaire subtests was also quite good. Because teacher ratings of the administrator was the major criterion for examining the function of the API, the authors wisely claim only that the instrument provides information on the "probable" job-related characteristics of the applicant with emphasis on the building of positive "administrator-teacher relationships and positive, open school climate." There is no information on how well the instrument predicts future student or staff outcomes. "Theme" scores are highly related to each other ( $r_s$  between .42 & .68). Therefore, the authors are correct to specify that the themes do not measure different dimensions of administrator behavior.

**Practical Considerations:** The API can only be given and scored by trained and certified Administrator Perceiver Specialists. The interview is untimed but typically takes about one hour.

**Other Comments:** The authors recommend against using the API as the sole criterion for selection or evaluation of personnel. The authors are very up-front about the information they have about the instrument, what they done have, and therefore what it measures. This instrument appears to be a promising approach for employment decisions, but because it requires trained interviewers to give, it would not be useful for informal self-assessment.

**Availability:** Selection Research, Inc.  
P.O. Box 5700  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68505  
402-489-9000

**Title of Instrument:** Leadership Skills Inventory (1985)

**Authors:** Dr. Frances A. Karnes and Dr. Jane C. Chauvin

**Description:** The Leadership Skills Inventory is a self-administered and self-scored 125-item inventory of personal leadership skills designed for use with individuals grade 4 to adult who are aspiring to improve their potential for leadership roles. Leadership functions and skills are covered. The instrument was designed primarily as a diagnostic/prescriptive tool in conjunction with a leadership skills training program also developed by the authors. Other uses might be in classes or clubs focusing on the leadership development of its members (such as student government, Boy Scouts, etc.) The authors also suggest uses in business and industry.

**Authors' Description of Subtests (Skill Areas):**

**Note:** The list of skills included for each skill area is meant to be illustrative not exhaustive.

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1. Fundamentals of Leadership (FL)    | Defining terms and identifying various leadership styles.  |
| 2. Written Communication Skills (WCS) | Outlining, writing a speech and research reports.  |
| 3. Speech Communication Skills (SCS)  | Defining one's viewpoint on issues, delivering a speech, and offering constructive criticism.                            |
| 4. Values Clarification (VC)          | Understanding the importance of free choice, identifying things that one values and prizes, and affirming one's choices. |
| 5. Decision Making Skills (DMS)       | Gathering facts, analyzing the consequences of certain decisions, and reaching logical conclusions.                      |
| 6. Group Dynamics Skills (GDS)        | Serving as a group facilitator, effecting compromise, and achieving consensus.   |
| 7. Problem Solving Skills (PSS)       | Identifying problems, revising strategies for problem solving, and accepting unpopular decisions.                        |
| 8. Personal Development Skills (PDS)  | Self-confidence, sensitivity, and personal grooming.   |
| 9. Planning Skills (PS)               | Setting goals, developing timelines, and formulating evaluation strategies.  |

**Score Interpretation:** The instrument is hand scored. A method is presented to profile examinees by comparing scores to the 452 students in the comparison group. The authors suggest that any score below the average of the comparison group indicates an area for improvement. Instructional activities geared to the skill areas are available.

**Reliability:** Internal consistency reliabilities of the subtests, based on 452 students, ranged from .78 to .93. This is good.

**Validity:** The authors reviewed the literature on leadership and decided that the skills necessary to be a leader fell into the nine categories listed above. The content of the instrument was reviewed with a panel of adults working in counseling situations and students. The instrument has been used as pre-post measure of an intensive one-week leadership training course for 65 9-17 year-olds. Gains on the instrument were significant. Another study of 59 students showed that student self-rates were very similar to those made by teachers experienced with the inventory. Studies of the instrument are continuously being done and it would still be nice to know such things as whether the 9 dimensions have statistical support; to know the extent to which examinees can alter their profiles to produce a desired outcome, and to know how self-report of skills (e.g., "I can compare and contrast ideas in my writing") compare to actual measurement of these skills.

**Practical Considerations:** The Inventory is untimed but takes about 45 minutes to give. The examinee answers in the inventory booklet, therefore they are not reusable. Inventories are hand scored. A computerized form of the inventory will be available soon. It will generate a student profile.

**Other Comments:** There is no information on how to interpret and use this instrument for groups other than youth. Therefore, use in business and industry would be experimental. The intent of this instrument is to indicate present levels of skills attainment to be used for self-improvement. The information gathered so far indicated that the instrument is certainly adequate for this purpose. However, because information is lacking on some of the validity issues related above, this instrument should not, at this time, be used to make important, long-term decisions about examinees.

**Availability:** D.O.K. Publishers  
P.O. Box 605  
East Aurora, N.Y. 14052

**Title:** NASSP Assessment Centers (1985)

**Author:** National Association of Secondary School Principals

**Description:** This procedure is a 2-day performance assessment designed for prospective school principals as a tool for professional growth. Results are often also used as one piece of evidence for selecting principals. It is not designed as an evaluation tool for existing principals. Both leadership functions and personal traits are covered. Participants are involved in 6-8 exercises - leadership group exercises, in-basket exercises, fact-finding exercises and structured interviews.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:**

1. **Problem Analysis** Ability to seek out relevant data and analyze complex information to determine the important elements of a problem situation; searching for information with a purpose.
2. **Judgment** Ability to reach logical conclusions and make high quality decisions based on available information; skill in identifying educational needs and setting priorities; ability to evaluate critically written communications.
3. **Organizational Ability** Ability to plan, schedule and control the work of others; skill in using resources in an optimal fashion; ability to deal with a volume of paperwork and heavy demands on one's time.
4. **Decisiveness** Ability to recognize when a decision is required (disregarding the quality of the decision) and to act quickly.
5. **Leadership** Ability to get others involved in solving problems; ability to recognize when a group requires direction, to interact with a group effectively and to guide them to the accomplishment of a task.
6. **Sensitivity** Ability to perceive the needs, concerns and personal problems of others; skill in resolving conflicts; tact in dealing with persons from different backgrounds; ability to deal effectively with people concerning emotional issues; knowing what information to communicate and to whom.
7. **Stress Tolerance** Ability to perform under pressure and during opposition; ability to think on one's feet.
8. **Oral Communication** Ability to make a clear oral presentation of facts or ideas.
9. **Written Communication** Ability to express ideas clearly in writing; to write appropriately for different audiences - students, teachers, parents et al.
10. **Range of Interest** Competence to discuss a variety of subjects - educational, political, current events, economic, etc.; desire to actively participate in events.
11. **Personal Motivation** Need to achieve in all activities attempted; evidence that work is important to personal satisfaction; ability to be self-policing.
12. **Educational Values** Possession of a well-reasoned educational philosophy; receptiveness to new ideas and change.

**Score Interpretation:** Performance on these tasks is observed by trained assessors who look for specific behaviors that are translated into scores in the 12 areas described above. Twelve to 24 participants are assessed at a time by 6-12 assessors. A person's final score is a numerical translation of behaviors on tasks that is reached by a consensus of assessors. All protocols are hand scored. There are norms developed over a 6-year period based on performance of actual principals, although we did not see a report on how these were developed.

**Reliability:** Interrater reliabilities (6 raters, 350 participants) were above .90 for all 12 dimensions. The reliability of the procedure is enhanced by having several raters contribute to the final rating of each candidate.

**Validity:** The assessment center concept was originally developed in the 1930's in the military. Since then applications have been developed in business, government, industry and education. The NASSP project was initiated in 1975. We received no information on how the assessment tasks were originally developed. A validation study was conducted from 1979-1981 by Michigan State University. Information was gathered on 167 individuals. They found out (1) ratings by experienced principals of how important the skills covered in the assessment were for tasks principals actually have to perform were quite high; (2) correlations were low to moderate between supervisor and colleague ratings of performance and center scores; (3) correlations between information on school climate and center ratings was low to moderate. A subsequent study (N not reported) showed a consistent relationship between supervisor ratings and center scores. Teacher and support staff ratings were not related to center scores. There was no information supplied as to how scores relate to student outcomes or whether the data support the 12 separate rating areas. This information is suggestive of validity but is not conclusive. However, the lack of conclusiveness may be as much due to the nature of the criterion measures as to the performance center tasks.

**Practical Considerations:** The cost of assessment to participants varies by site depending on their funding sources. In Oregon, the cost is \$125. Candidates must be assessed at the center during a 2-day process.

**Other Comments:** NASSP has a training component that accompanies the assessment. This is a 3-day event that focuses in on areas chosen by the participant - usually areas of weakness identified by the assessment. There is a mentor doing the training who also interacts on-the-job with the participant. Currently there are about 5,000 trained assessors. About 7,000 persons have been assessed. Assessors are trained through an intensive, standardized, 4-day process. Projects are accredited by NASSP to be assessment centers if the project meets several criteria, e.g., training by NASSP, refresher courses, standardized procedures are followed, etc.

**Availability:** NASSP Assessment Centers  
1904 Association Dr.  
Reston, VA 22091  
(703) 860-0200

There are currently 47 assessment centers in 35 states. Contact the national office to obtain information on where these are located.

**Instruments and Procedures Designed  
for General Business and Industry**

**Title of Instrument:** Human Resource Development Report (1987)  
Based on the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (1978)

**Authors:** Institute for Personality and Ability Testing

**Description:** The HRDR is a report designed to "help individuals better understand themselves in a managerial role." It is based on responses to the 16 PFQ, an extensively researched and widely used adult personality test. The HRDR is suggested for use in hiring, promotion and career development. It attempts to measure personality dimensions and traits that may be considered in determining an individual's potential for management success. The 16 PFQ is a 187-item questionnaire on which the examinee selects the response that is true for him or her.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:**

1. Leadership              Overall potential to influence group performance-leadership style (assertive, permissive or facilitative) and evaluating others.
2. Interaction with others      Social skills and personal working style (extroversion, warmth, cheerfulness, self-sufficiency and shrewdness).
3. Decision-making ability      Reasoning and decision-making abilities.
4. Initiative              Overall motivation and workstyle.
5. Personal Adjustment Reaction to stress, self-control, anxiety, suspiciousness, etc.
6. Distortion              This is a special scale designed to detect "faking good."

**Score Interpretation:** Patterns of scores trigger statements from a statement library that provides an analysis of what the pattern implies in terms of the scales listed above. The statements are very descriptive and present a clear picture of behaviors and activities in various areas. (The very appearance of absolute certainty, however, may be a drawback because there can always be measurement error on tests and there is never a perfect correlation between scores and criteria. Untrained users may overrely on the report as the "truth".) There are norms. An ideal profile is, however, not specified. The authors state "it is not the goal of the HRDR to establish desirable or ideal management style characteristics within the 5 critical dimensions. Such decisions must be left to the users since organizations vary a great deal in terms of functions and needs of various management positions." Thus, how to interpret the results with respect to the desirable profile is left up to the user. There is help with how to do a job analysis in order to match HRDR profile to local needs, how to use the HRDR in an interview and how to go over results with an individual.

**Reliability:** Average test-retest reliabilities (based on 12 studies) range from .81 (two weeks) to .52 (8 years). These are good, but no other reliability information is presented.

**Validity:** The five dimensions are covered because a review of the literature showed them to be "recurrent themes." These dimensions also appeared to be applicable to a variety of management levels. There has been a great deal of research on how the various scales relate to success outcomes in business settings. Success and outcome criteria have included salary, supervisor ratings, ratings of effectiveness by managerial consultants, comparisons of those having made significant contributions to their field versus those not, etc. There has been at least one study in the area of education, which showed that high scores on independence are

related to higher absenteeism. The distortion scale was developed by comparing the response patterns of those instructed to "fake good" or "fake bad" with regular examinees.

**Practical Considerations:** The 16 PFQ takes about 45 minutes to give. It requires a 7th grade reading ability. The 16 PFQ must be machine scored in order to generate the HRDR report because it relies on analyzing combinations of responses in relation to each other to look at management traits in depth.

**Other Comments:** The authors recommend that this be only one of several pieces of information used for hiring and promotions. Although a great deal of work has gone into the report, we would want to see more evidence of how scale scores relate to performance and outcomes specific to educational settings before endorsing its use for hiring or promotion. Informal use of for self-profiling discussion is appropriate.

The HRDR is based on a personality test. Items on these tests are usually chosen because they distinguish between groups or relate to various criteria in certain ways. The items do not ask specifically about leadership behaviors. Thus, the items are things like "Money can buy almost anything" and "I prefer classical to modern music." Although questions such as these do not seem to have face validity for looking at leadership, there seems to have been research on how patterns of answers to these types of questions relate to various leadership and management behaviors and styles. There is still some question, however, how appropriate and accurate it is to use broad-based personality instruments to predict specific behavior rather than use instruments specifically designed to directly measure the performance of interest (Buros 9:1137, 2 reviews).

**Availability:**

Institute for Personality and Ability Testing  
P.O. Box 188  
Champaign, IL 61820

**Title of Instrument:** Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (1963)

**Authors:** Ohio State University

**Description:** This 30-item Likert instrument apparently can be used either for self-report by the leader or subordinate perception of supervisor behavior. Leadership style is emphasized.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:**

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Consideration<br>(CS)        | Behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group.   |
| 2. Initiating Structure<br>(IS) | The extent to which the leader organizes and defines the relationship between himself and the members of his group, defines the role expected of each group member, endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of organization and communicates ways of getting the job done. |

**Score Interpretation:** In our source of this instrument there was no help with interpretation and use.

**Reliability:** A Buros review (8:1174) states that "the LBDQ seems to possess internally consistent scales; raters appear to agree to a sufficient degree when using the scale to describe a leader's behavior..." There is no information on test-retest reliability. Our source of this scale has no further information.

**Validity:** The instruments were developed by a process of developing items to measure several hypothesized dimensions of leadership and then using factor analysis to discover the dimensionality of the instrument. Two dominant dimensions emerged - consideration and initiating structure. The instrument was revised to 30 items based on this information; 15 for each dimension. The instrument has been used in a large number of research studies looking at the relationship between the dimensions measured by the instruments and subordinate satisfaction, performance, differences between various groups, etc. A Buros review (8:1174) states that the "IS and CS scales appear to be related to such important criteria as satisfaction, performance and grievances." Thus the scale appears to measure outcomes in some settings. There is no information on how the scale predicts future performance and no specifics about use in educational settings. This, plus its age, may limit its usefulness for educational applications.

**Practical Considerations:** The instrument was developed mainly for research purposes. The instrument is not packaged for easy use by practitioners. One has to consult a considerable body of research to discover the rationale and development of the instrument and how it has been applied in various settings. There is a parallel version - the LBDQ-Ideal scale which asks subordinates to indicate how an ideal supervisor should act. The results are then compared to the LBDQ REAL version.

**Other Comments:** The instrument has mainly been used in research studies. There have been several versions of them and it is not always clear which version is being discussed in any given research study. Form 12 is recommended as being the best by several authors but we have been unable to track it down thus far.

**Availability:** This instrument, and the updated LBDQ-12 is no longer available from Ohio State University. ERIC ED 251 862 has a 38-item version of the LBDQ. It is not clear what version this is and how it relates to the 30-item version. Muth (1987) also provides an 80-item version.

**References:** Neal, Kay, The Relationship Between Human Communication, Functional Dominance and the Dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure. Structures on Leadership Styles. 1982, ERIC ED 251 862.

Muth, R., Leadership: A question of clarity. Paper presented at AERA, 1987. Fordham University, Division of Administration, Policy and Urban education, New York, NY, 10023-7478.

**Title:** Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (1969)

**Author:** Edwin Fleishman

**Description:** The LOQ is a 40-item self-report measure of leadership style on which the respondent indicates how frequently he or she believes one should do what is described by each item. The instrument was designed for a variety of industrial and business settings. Uses have included personnel selection, evaluation, counseling and training. The authors urge that users validate the instrument for these uses in their own setting.

**Author's Description of Subtests:**

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1. Consideration<br>(C) | The extent to which an individual is likely to have job relationships with subordinates characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings and warmth. |
| 2. Structure<br>(S)     | The extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal attainment.   |

**Score Interpretation:** The instrument is self-scoring. A high score on C indicates good rapport and two-way communication. A high score on S indicates an active role in directing group activities. Low C scores are indicative of an undesirable situation (since there have been no studies showing that low C scores are associated with good performance). The desirable scoring pattern for S depends on the situation. The author urges that users do their own studies on how various scoring patterns relate to the outcomes important in their organization. In general, the author claims that above average C & S patterns are most likely to optimize outcomes across various outcome indicators. Averages and standard deviations are given for 34 groups (none in education). Norms are currently being updated for a variety of job groups and should be available by summer, 1988.

**Reliability:** Internal consistency reliability for 6 samples ( $N = 80$  to 394) ranges from .62 to .89 (median = .76) for consideration and .69 to .88 (median = .82) for structure. Test-retest reliability for 2 samples ( $N = 24$  & 31) were .67 to .80. These are good for this type of instrument. No information is presented about educational administrators.

**Validity:** The instrument is an outgrowth of the series developed for the Ohio State University leadership studies. The two dimensions on which it is based are the result of factor analytic studies. The current instrument appears also to measure independent dimensions because the correlation between the 2 subscales (based on 17 studies with  $N = 21$  to 394) is around zero. The correlation between C & S scores and various independent measures of verbal ability and achievement are also around zero. This indicates that what is measured by these types of tests is different from what is measured by the LOQ and that readability of the LOQ is not a factor in how people respond. There have been a variety of studies to see how C & S relate to various outcomes in various settings. Some of these (none in education) show moderate relationships. The relationships are not consistent across settings and outcomes. There is no Buros review of the instrument.

**Practical Considerations:** The answer sheet is nonreusable and self-scoring. The instrument is untimed but takes about 15 minutes.

**Other Comments:** This instrument has been used extensively in various research and applied settings. Its usefulness appears to vary depending on the use and setting. Little information has been presented about its use in education. There is some controversy about the dimensionality of supervisory skills and traits. This instrument may not tap all the skills important in various settings. However, it does have a long history of use and may be useful for self-assessment in educational settings.

**Availability:** Science Research Associates, Inc.  
Information Systems  
Educational Division  
9th Floor  
155 N. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 984-7016

**Title of Instrument:** Managerial Philosophies Scale (1986)

**Authors:** Jacob Jacoby and James R. Terborg

**Description:** This instrument asks the respondent the degree to which he or she agrees or disagrees with each of 36 statements. The purpose is to determine one's reliance on a Theory X or Theory Y view of mankind. This information is used for self-assessment training - to illustrate a respondent's profile with respect to this particular model.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:** There are no subtests.

**Score Interpretation:** Theory X reflects the belief that employees are incapable of innovation and responsibility and need to be controlled by extrinsic rewards and punishments. Theory Y reflects the belief that employees are motivated by extrinsic and intrinsic rewards and are capable of self-control and autonomy. There is a lengthy discussion of Theories X and Y, the overall theoretical advantage of Theory Y and the possible behaviors associated with Theory X and Y managers. There are comparison scores based on 4,907 managers. The comparisons table is updated periodically. One looks for Theory X or Y scores outside the "normal" range of this comparison group.

**Reliability:** Several studies have shown the reliability of the 24-item X scale and 12-item Y scale to be between .77 and .89 (N=161 supervisors and 275 non-supervisors). This is good.

**Validity:** This instrument is based on the Theory X-Theory Y analysis of managerial approaches to subordinate motivation and organizational behavior (McGregor, 1960). There is evidence provided that the scales are negatively related to each other (as one would expect) and that score patterns relate to other measures and characteristics of respondents in an expected manner. There is inconsistent information reported on the relationship of profiles to "managerial achievement." There is no information about the ability of respondents to "fake good." There is also no discussion of use in educational settings.

**Practical Considerations:** The instrument is self-scoring. (There is a carbon underlay that shows how responses are scored.)

**Other Comments:** This is an interesting instrument. There is sufficient information presented for its use in self-profiling. Lack of information about the relationship of profiles to effects and performance in educational settings means that the instrument should not be used for any important, long-term decisions about respondents.

**Availability:** Teleometrics, Int'l.  
1755 Woodstead Crt.  
The Woodlands, TX 77380

**References:** McGregor, D. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

**Title of Instrument:** Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator, (1983)

**Authors:** Isabel Briggs Meyers

**Description:** The newest form of the Meyers-Briggs (Form 6) has 126 items on which the respondent indicates how he or she usually acts or feels in each situation presented. A manual--*Using the Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator in Organizations* (1985) by Sandra Hirsh describes how to use the results within organizations. Specifically, with respect to management, the results are used to provide participants with information about their managerial skills and style to use for their own information on match to position, match to employees style and how to get work done through the efforts of others. The stated purpose is not for hiring and promotion decisions.

**Authors' Description of Personality Types:**

1. Perception (taking in information) v. Judgment (coming to conclusions)
2. Sensing (reliance on 5 senses) v. Intuition (reliance on hunches)
3. Thinking (making decisions based on data) v. Feeling (making decisions based on values or on impact of decisions on people)
4. Introvert (finding energy in one's inner world of ideas, concepts and abstractions) v. Extroverts (finding energy in the world outside of themselves)

**Score Interpretation:** There are 16 personality types based on combinations of the features above. There is an emphasis on the fact that there are no "right" or "wrong" types - each has its strengths and weaknesses. The emphasis is on how various types act in different situations and how to use this information to promote harmony and productivity. There is no "ideal" managerial profile provided and no indication of how various profiles match up to different settings. There are exercises designed to lead the examinees to their own insights and conclusions in this regard.

**Reliability:** Test-retest reliabilities of the Meyers-Briggs range from .48 (14 months) to .87 (7 weeks). (See Buros 9:740). This is acceptable.

**Validity:** The Meyers-Briggs has been extensively researched. A Buros review (9:739) and the manual say that responses can be altered depending on what a person feels the "right" way to be is. The manual implies that these effects can be minimized by using the instrument for self assessment only. The Buros review, although generally positive with respect to the instrument, states that "additional validity studies in which behaviors are clearly and logically related to the dimensions the instrument measures are suggested." In other words, although there has been lots of study on the dimensions and constructs, there has been little research on how people with various styles actually act. This is evident in the manual reviewed here, where statements are made about how various types would act in work settings without any evidence to show this is true. There is no information presented about educational settings.

**Practical Considerations:** The instrument takes about an hour to give. It is hand or machine scored.

**Other Comments:** There is a short form. The Buros review recommends against its use because of decreased reliability. Because this is a general personality instrument, the items do not relate directly to managerial themes. Thus, they do not have the same "face validity" as more specific instruments. (See the HRDR for additional comments along this line.) This is an interesting approach to assessing traits, but best used informally at this time.

**Availability:** Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.  
577 College Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94306

**Title of Instrument:** Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership (1979)

**Authors:** Charles W. Nelson and Jasper J. Valenti

**Description:** This instrument is designed to assess organizational leadership styles. The respondent looks at 50 situations and indicates both the most desirable way to handle the situation described and the actual behavior of colleagues. The purpose is an informal appraisal prior to leadership attitude development.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:** There are 18 possible scores based on: Ideal and Actual behavior for each of four Leadership Styles and five Management Areas.

**Leadership Styles:**

(These are based on the leader's perception of the source of organization sanction. For more description of these areas see C.W. Nelson and E.V. Smith (1976), A Frame of Reference for the Measurement of Institutional Leadership Concepts and the Analysis of System States. *Human Relations*, 29, pp 589-606.)

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| A. Bureaucratic | The source of authority is in rules and regulations.                |
| B. Technocratic | The source of authority is in technical knowledge.                  |
| C. Idiocratic   | The source of authority is in individual personalities.             |
| D. Democratic   | The source of authority is in the codes and standards of the group. |

**Management Areas:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. How the leader sees himself in his job.                        | Recognition of role and responsibility in strengthening the organization and serving employees |
| 2. How the supervisor deals with formal lines of authority.       | Extent and effectiveness of vertical communication   |
| 3. How the leader coordinates and maintains effective production. | Extent and effectiveness of horizontal communication   |
| 4. How the leader develops the individual.                        | Extent and effectiveness of personnel selection, orientation and development of capabilities.  |

5. How the leader builds and maintains group effort and teamwork. Extent and effectiveness of developing group effort, cooperation and teamwork

**Score Interpretation:** Item responses are interpreted into four styles of leadership and five management area scores plus a total Interaction Index. These are illustrated and described by source of organizational sanction which has been labeled A-Bureaucratic; B-Technocratic; C-Idiocratic; and D-Democratic. There is also help with interpreting actual versus ideal concepts. There are averages for education groups in college, business, and government programs at local and national levels.

**Reliability:** Using the Kuder-Richardson formula the reliabilities are: Leadership Style A - .79; B - .74; C - .65; D - .87. These are fair-good.

**Validity:** The authors report that development was based on 35 years of applied research. In a personal communication they cite the following validation activities: Leadership styles were derived from "situated attitudes" (not traits) presented by "paired comparison" developed by Dr. Guilford to measure subtle differences. Professional evaluation of items against concepts; test-retest for stability; validation against morale level; accident reactions to supervisors; projective analysis against leadership styles; and observations of leader behavior by superiors against leadership scores.

Measures of leadership styles were also validated against interviews over a period of three years. The major goal of this research was to provide evidence that leadership style could have greater and more lasting effects when approached on an organizational rather than just an individual base. Public schools also show different organizational leadership patterns.

**Practical Considerations:** There is no time limit but it takes about 35 - 45 minutes to complete. The instrument is self-scoring via a carbon underlay that records responses and shows how points are assigned to profile the leadership pattern. Feedback is accomplished by having leaders analyze and report in small groups their evaluation of the leadership items. This is done by identifying the source or authority being used, the style of communication, and how they think students would react.

**Other Comments:** This instrument was designed for high school and college leadership development programs. The authors feel that given the lack of understanding that leadership is a function of "situated attitudes" (not individual traits) it should not be used for selection or promotion, etc. Instead it should be used as an organizational approach to leadership development and an opportunity for leaders to obtain insight into values underlying their pattern of leadership. The concepts covered by this instrument derive directly from a comprehensive and detailed theory of organizational development. For best use we recommend that the authors be asked for supplemental interpretive information when the instrument is ordered so that users can properly interpret the results.

**Availability:** Charles W. Nelson  
 Management Research Associates  
 R.R. 25, Box 26  
 Terre Haute, Indiana 47802

**Title of Instrument:** Situational Leadership Instrument Package

**Authors:** Paul Hersey, Kenneth H. Blanchard, Walter E. Natemeyer, Ronald K. Hamilton, Joseph W. Keilty, Dean Harrington and Selma L. Harrington

**Description:** This is a group of related instruments:

The Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD), 1973, has 12 items and is based on Ohio State's studies of leadership styles -task behavior versus leadership behavior. There are parallel forms for self and subordinate ratings.

The Readiness Scale, 1937, has 10 items to measure subordinates' readiness to self-direct themselves on tasks. There are leader and subordinate forms.

The Power Perception Profile, 1987, has 21 items designed to measure how the leader uses various types of power bases. There are forms for rating oneself and rating others.

The Interaction Influence Analysis, 1980, appears to be an observational checklist. An observer would keep track of nine behaviors of a leader and subordinate during an interaction.

The Leadership Scale, 1980, has 10 items designed to see what leadership style leaders use with particular employees individually.

The Problem-Solving, Decision-Making Style Inventory, 1982, has 12 items designed to self-report on problem-solving and decision-making styles.

**Score Interpretation:** The LEAD, Readiness Scale and Power Perception Profile seem to go together. Leadership styles are situational--different styles are better for subordinates who are self-directing than those who are not. Also, the type of power base having a high probability of gaining compliance varies depending on readiness. There are procedures provided to compare and interpret these scores in light of these interdependencies. The other measures are tied into various other aspects of the authors' leadership paradigm. There is assistance with interpretation. There are no norms.

**Reliability:** None provided.

**Validity:** The LEAD is based on the work at Ohio State in the 50's. There is no information provided for any of the instruments on how well they measure the dimensions they claim to, how scales relate to outcomes, etc. There is no information on applications in educational settings.

**Practical Considerations:** All instruments are short, easy to take and easy to score.

**Other Comments:** Given the lack of technical information and lack of information on applications in educational settings, use of this package should be no more than informal self-assessment.

**Availability:** University Associates, Inc.  
8517 Production Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92121  
(619) 578-5900

**Title of Instrument:** Styles of Leadership Survey (1986)

**Authors:** Jay Hall and Martha Williams

**Description:** This 60-item instrument focuses on leadership styles based on the two dimensions of concern for people and concern for outcome. These are the same dimensions covered by several other instruments and are based on the Managerial Grid (Blake & Moulton, 1964). It is designed as a self-assessment training tool for a variety of educational, business and industrial settings. The authors claim, based on a large volume of previous evidence, that the styles covered apply to this variety of settings. The examinee indicates how characteristic each of 60 statements is of him or her. This instrument is very similar to the Styles of Management Inventory from the same publisher.

**Score Interpretations:** The instrument is hand-scored. Based on responses, the examinee places him or herself on a 2-dimensional grid. One's leadership style (and strength of style) is based on how one's scores compare to scores of 2,844 other people who have used the scale. The magnitude of the difference between style scores indicates the relative amount of use of the various styles and how resistant one is to move from the dominant style to backup styles. There is assistance in understanding what the profiles mean. There is a companion instrument, The Leadership Appraisal Survey which gathers information from coworkers on one's style.

**Reliability:** There is little information reported in the manual. The authors state that "the median coefficient of stability is greater than .70". This is fair if this is test-retest reliability of a reasonably sized group. There is, however, no mention about what group the stability coefficient has been calculated on. There is no other information reported.

**Validity:** The instrument is based on a two-dimensional theory of leadership (Blake & Moulton, 1964). There was no discussion in the material sent of how or why the items relate to that theoretical model. Mention is made of the use of the instrument in research. Most of the studies reported related to differences in style types between organizational types, level of management, etc. One set of studies examined how style related to personality measures. The authors report that "the 5 styles correlate significantly with personality traits in ways consistent with the underlying grid theory." There is no detail provided on what the sample consisted of or how the study was carried out. There was no analysis of the dimensionality of the instrument.

There was also no evidence presented as to how styles relate to any kind of outcomes and no specific information or application to educational settings. These two facts may restrict its usefulness in education. (A Euro's review, 8:1185, feels that the instrument is lacking in its proof of validity.)

**Practical Considerations:** The instrument is self-administered and hand-scored. There is no indication of about how long it takes, but it seems to be easy to take and score.

**Other Comments:** This instrument could be used for informal self-assessment.

**Availability:** Teleometrics International  
1755 Woodstead Court  
The Woodlands, Texas 77380  
(713) 367-0060

**Reference:** Robert Blake and Jane Moulton, The Managerial Grid, Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1964.

**Title of Instrument:** Styles of Management Inventory (1986)

**Authors:** Jay Hall, Jerry Harvey and Martha Williams

**Description:** This 60-item instrument focuses on management styles based on the two dimensions of concern for people and concern for outcomes. These are the same dimensions covered by several other instruments and are based on the Managerial Grid (Blake & Moulton, 1964). It is designed as a self-assessment training tool for a variety of educational, business and industrial settings. The authors claim, based on a large volume of previous evidence, that the styles covered apply to this variety of settings. The examinee indicates how characteristic each of 60 statements is of him or her. This instrument is very similar to the Styles of Leadership Inventory from the same publisher.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:** There are no separately scored subtests or scales.

**Score Interpretations:** The instrument is hand-scored. Based on responses, the examinee places him or herself on a 2-dimensional grid. One's leadership style (and strength of style) is based on how one's scores compare to scores of 12,809 other managers who have used the scale. The magnitude of the difference between style scores indicates the relative amount of use of the various styles and how resistant one is to move from the dominant style to backup styles. There is assistance in understanding what the profiles mean. There is a companion instrument, The Management Appraisal Survey, which gathers information from coworkers on one's style.

**Reliability:** There is little information reported in the manual. The authors state that "the median coefficient of stability is .72". This is acceptable if this is test-retest reliability on a reasonably sized group. There is, however, no mention about what group the stability coefficient has been calculated on. There is no other information reported.

**Validity:** The validity information in the manual is very limited and relies on briefly summarizing longer reports. The authors report studies that show: (1) subordinate appraisals correlate with the manager self-report; (2) scores correlate in a predictable manner with scores on a personality measure; and (3) the instrument discriminates between high, average and low achieving managers (the criteria for achievement is not described). There is no discussion of how or why the items reflect the underlying model of Blake & Moulton and there is no report of the dimensionality of the instrument. There is no information on how styles relate to student or staff outcomes in an educational setting; and no information of the instrument's applicability in education. This limits the usefulness of the instrument in educational settings. (A Buro's review, 8:1185, feels that the instrument is lacking in its proof of validity.)

**Practical Considerations:** The instrument is self-administered and hand-scored. There is no indication of about how long it takes, but it seems to be easy to take and score.

**Other Comments:** This instrument might be used for informal self-assessment.

**Availability:** Teleometrics International  
1755 Woodstead Court  
The Woodlands, Texas 77380  
(713) 367-0060

**Reference:** Robert Blake and Jane Moulton, The Managerial Grid, Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1964.

**Title of Instrument:** XYZ Inventory (1975)

**Authors:** W.J. Reddin and Brian Sullivan

**Description:** There are 42 items in which the respondent indicates the extent to which he or she agrees with the statement presented. The purpose is to identify underlying assumptions about the nature of man--Theory X, Y or Z. Among the proposed uses are management-supervisory training and personnel selection.

**Authors' Description of Subtests:** There are no subtests.

**Score Interpretation:** Theory X states that man is basically a beast who is best controlled by civilization, he is inherently evil, is driven by his biological impulses, and his basic interaction mode is competition. Theory Y states that man is basically a self-actualizing person who works best with few controls, he is inherently good, and his basic interactional mode is cooperative. Theory Z states that man is basically a rational being open to and controlled by reason, he is inherently neither good nor evil but open to both, is driven by his intellect, and his basic interactional mode is interdependence. Raw scores on each scale are compared to norms based on 648 managers. There is no information on desirable profiles for various positions or situations and no other help in interpretation and use.

**Reliability:** Test-retest reliability (N=107) range from .55 to .76. The reliability is acceptable but the N is small.

**Validity:** The information provided with the instrument is very brief. There is no description of how the instrument was developed, nor any proof that the scales are indeed measures of theories X, Y, and Z. Brief descriptions of 5 studies report a variety of findings relating age, years of education and length of time at a lower level position to relative scores on the various scales. Such descriptive studies do not necessarily, however, provide evidence of validity because there is no discussion of how personality type should relate to these variables. There is no information about educational settings. Two reviews in Buros (9:1405) agree that validity information is lacking.

**Practical Considerations:** The inventory is self-scoring--there is a carbon underlay that indicates the points scored on each scale based on responses. It can also be machine-scored. It takes 10-20 minutes to take. It can be scored by hand, or machine-scored by the publisher.

**Other Comments:** Given the lack of validity studies and information on use in education, we recommend use for only informal self-assessment.

**Availability:** Organizational Tests, Ltd.  
Box 328  
Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada  
E3B 4Y9

**Other Published Instruments**

### Other Published Instruments

This section includes instruments that are published and appear to have had extensive development effort, but we had not obtained full review copies by the time of publication.

**Multiple Management Styles Inventory (1986)** by August W. Smith, A.W.S. Associates, 3710 Stillmeadow, Bryan, TX 77802.

An administrator responds to 50 questions by indicating which of two statements are more like him or her. The statements cover abilities and motivating factors. The results are interpreted in relation to 5 managerial styles: intervenor, implementor, initiator, investigator, and integrator. The instrument is based on Meyers-Briggs research and on an earlier instrument, the *Managerial Diagnostic Test* (1972). Recently, the author has applied the inventory to educational settings. Norms are available for business managers. New norms and interpretive data should be available on education administrators in winter 1988. The author will make the inventory available to anyone who will share the results.

**Profile of a School (1986)** by Jane G. Likert and Rensis Likert. Available from: Rensis Likert Associates, Suite 401, Wolverine Tower, 3001 S. State Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48108.

This set of questionnaires attempts to assess school climate and administrator effectiveness. It is based on research done at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. The different forms survey students, staff, superintendents, school board members, and parents. Technical information was not received in time to evaluate the instruments. Our information comes from two sources: *Looking at Schools: Instruments and Processes for School Analysis* (Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, 1987) and J.G. Likert and R. Likert, *New Resources for Improving School Administration*. NASSP Bulletin, 64, April 1980, pp 49-58. There are 3 types of variables covered on the instruments: causal variables (things that leaders can modify that have a direct effect on staff and student intervening and end-result variables; these include supervisory leadership, amount of structure and climate); intervening variables (things that reflect the internal state and health of the organization such as loyalties, motivation and attitudes); and end-results variables (things that show the actual outcomes such as satisfaction and performance).

These variables are interpreted in terms of leadership style - exploitive authoritarian, benevolent authoritarian, consultative or participative. The authors provide evidence that the participative style is most effective. There is some help on how to move more toward a participative style.

**Appendix B**  
**Research Instruments -- Short Reviews**

## **Research Instruments**

This section provides short reviews of instruments that have been developed for use in research. Criteria for inclusion in this section are that: each instrument has technical information reported; the intent of the instrument was use for the current or related research projects; there is generally little assistance with interpretation and use; the instrument is provided in the report referenced; and the instrument is in a source that is accessible.

These are included for users who want to look at alternatives to published instruments or see what is currently being developed.

**Administrator Professional Leadership Scale**, Bruce Thompson (1974). *Can be found in Refinement of the Administrator Professional Leadership Scale (APLS-II)*, ERIC ED 175 911.

The APLS was developed to "measure the professional leadership quality of a school principal, and to provide principals with anonymous feedback on teachers' perceptions of their leadership." The final instrument has 18 items on which subordinates rate the principal on a scale of one to seven. There are three subscales developed through factor analysis -- instructional leadership, personal warmth, and managerial effectiveness. There is no information on reliability and no further information about validity.

**Humanistic Leadership Questionnaire**, C. Eagleton, and R. Cogdell (1981). *The Humanistic leadership model: A pilot investigation*. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 5, 51-70.

Humanistic leadership is defined by the authors to be the administration of organizational purposes which maximizes human potential. The model assumes that humanistic leadership will lead to the greatest amount of organizational efficiency and effectiveness. The questionnaire has 52 items which ask about the 15 principles and 11 practices of the humanistic leadership model. Superintendents self-report about their attitudes and behaviors. Examples of principles are "responsibility and authority must be mutually delegated," "the administrator must always be preparing subordinates to move into positions of higher authority, including his own," and "staff membership must not be allowed to increase or decrease without justification." Examples of practices are "establish a regularly scheduled, formal advisory system," "share information openly as a normal duty," and "reward positive patterns of behavior; redirect negative patterns of behavior." The authors did a small study in which a factor analysis found four factors -- two which agreed with the model and two which did not. There is really not enough information presented on reliability or validity for interpretation or use.

**Instructional Activity Questionnaire** (1984) by Terry J. Larsen, University of Colorado, Boulder. Available in AERA presentation, April 20-24, 1987.

Teachers and principals are asked to rate the principal's implementation of 2 school-chosen activities using a 32-item questionnaire organized into six areas: goal setting, school community relations, supervision and evaluation, school climate, coordination, and staff development. The items were generated using a Delphi procedure. The scale was used in a study comparing high and low achieving schools. Ten of the behaviors were rated more frequently by teachers in high achieving than low achieving schools. The author also analyzed the discrepancies between teacher and principal responses - teachers and principals agreed more consistently in their ratings at the high achieving schools. No reliability information is presented.

**Leader Authenticity Scale**, James E. Henderson and Wayne K. Hoy (1982). Can be found in *Leader authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1982. Also available in ERIC ED 219 408.

This instrument was designed for use in the schools. It intends to measure leader authenticity, defined by the authors to be the extent to which subordinates perceive their leader to accept responsibility, treat them with respect, and perform actions necessary for the requirements of the situation rather than acting out a stereotyped role. There are 35 items. Development included several pilot testings including factor analysis, review by experts and correlation with teacher satisfaction and leader task accomplishment. The reliability is reported as .96. Assistance with interpretation and use of results is limited to a discussion of the concept. This is an interesting instrument, but it is not clear how it fits in with other conceptions of administrative responsibility and tasks.

**Leadership/Climate Inventory**, P. Watson, J. Crawford, and G. Kimball (1985). *The school makes a difference: Analysis of teacher perceptions of their principal and school climate*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, March 1985. Also in ERIC ED 266 529.

This instrument was assembled by Oklahoma City Schools. It is an 82-item questionnaire completed by teachers about their principal. The eight areas focus on the principal's high expectations, instructional leadership, dynamism, effective use of consultation, ability to create order, use of resources, use of time, and ability to evaluate effectively. On a sample of 1294 teachers, scale internal consistency reliabilities ranged from .90 to .97. Total scale reliability was .99. This is excellent. A factor analysis showed eight factors accounting for 99 percent of the variance. Only the first factor, Interpersonal/Affective Skills accounted for any substantial amount of variance. Thus it appears that the scale really only measures a general, overall view of the principal - teachers who rated their principal high in one area tended to rate him or her high in all the others. This one might be good for informal self-evaluation, but more work needs to be done on consistency of ratings between teachers in the same school and how ratings relate to actual outcomes. There is no help with interpretation and use of results.

**Management Behavior Survey**, Gary Yukl (1981). *Leadership in Organizations*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Also in N. Pitner and W.W. Charter, *Principal Influence on Teacher Behavior: Substitutes for Leadership*, ERIC ED 251 941.

Teachers respond to 115 items which ask the frequency with which their principal exhibits the behavior described in the item. There are 23 categories of management behavior -- Emphasizing Performance, Showing Consideration, Career Counselling, Inspiring Subordinates, Providing Praise and Recognition, Structuring Reward Contingencies, Clarifying Work Roles, Goal Setting, Training-Coaching, Disseminating Information, Encouraging Decision Participation, Delegating, Planning, Innovating, Problem Solving, Work Facilitation, Monitoring Operations, Monitoring the Environment, Representing the School, Facilitating Interaction, Managing Conflict, Criticizing, Administering Discipline. This instrument was originally developed for general use in business and industry. Pitner and Charter (ERIC ED 251 941) did a study of use in the schools. They eliminated seven of the scales because they did not apply to education. In a later study, Pitner and Hocevar (1987) eliminated nine scales and found that the remaining 14 were independent dimensions of administrator behavior. (That is, administrators can be good on some dimensions

and poor on others.) Interrater reliabilities are acceptable and range from .60 - .85. Since administrator functions as well as style are covered, this is an interesting instrument and has some potential for informal assessment. However, there is not enough information about it yet for formal use in the schools.

**Management Opinionnaire** by Walter E Sistrunk and Elton R. Jenkins (1980). Available in: **The Preferred Leadership Style of School Superintendents**, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 197 430, 46 pages.

This opinionnaire was developed with North Carolina superintendents and used in this study of preferred leadership styles of Mississippi superintendents. The 27 self-report statements are used to describe a superintendent's managerial leadership style in terms of Theory X, Theory Z, and five styles from the Managerial Grid model by Blake and Mouton. The superintendent's beliefs about the subordinate workers and the organization are also analyzed. The authors report that reliability was established during a pilot study with an alpha = .80. Questions were developed to discriminate between opposing leadership styles and reviewed for clarity. No other validity studies were undertaken. The styles are defined in the paper.

**Organizational Climate Survey**. See Donald G. Coleman (1981). *Leader Style Assessment*. Paper presented to the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration. Also in ERIC ED 202 150.

This 50-item instrument was designed to assess the performance of practicing school administrators. Subordinates provide their perceptions as to what the leader does to contribute to organizational efficiency and to personal feelings the subordinates have about themselves, their chosen career and the freedom to work in a manner they think best. The instrument is based on a review of the literature. Factor analytic studies have identified eight factors which group into three secondary factors: Task (Leader Goal Orientation, Training and Development, Leadership and Supervision); People (Self-Concept, Self-Image, Personal Freedom); Salary and Benefits (Salary and Benefits, Group Goal Orientation, Advancement Opportunity). (Note: Ten dimensions are listed above. The report says that these ten were reduced to eight through factor analysis. They do not say which were combined.) Norms are based on an ongoing pool of information at Northeastern Missouri State University. Administrators who fall above the average on both task and people dimensions are identified as the most effective and efficient. A printout provides a profile and a listing of the areas most in need of improvement. Reliability is .85 based on a very small sample size. There needs to be more work done on validity -- how scores relate to outcomes and how scales relate to other purported measures of similar constructs. However, it might be useful for informal self-assessment.

**Principal Leadership Power Profile**, P.R. Krysinski, D.B. Reed, T.D. Gougeon, and M.D. Armstrong (1987). *Assessing leadership qualities of school principals employing responses to case studies*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

The authors present an alternative way of evaluating and scoring the responses to case study situations such as those presented in the NAASP Assessment Centers. A case study exercise involves a typical administrative problem presented in narrative form. The examinee verbally presents a plan of action to solve the problem. In the Assessment Centers the response is scored by comparing the examinees solution to characteristics of a "right" solution. The authors feel this is inadequate because "administrative theory has not been developed to an extent which allows very precise guidance and assessment of administrative action." The authors present a theory of

leadership style and a method of scoring case study responses in terms of the administrative leadership style implied in the responses. There appears to be four components to a style profile. Administration and scoring require a good deal of training as does interpretation and use because the model is very complex. Test-retest reliabilities range from .72 to .80. This is an interesting approach but needs to be developed a bit more.

**The RAD Scales, Ralph M. Stogdill (1957).** Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957.

This instrument was developed as part of the Ohio State leadership and administrative performance research in the 50's. It is intended to measure an individual's perception of his own responsibility, authority and delegation. It was intended for use in various business and industrial settings. There are 48 items organized into 6 subscales. The examinee checks which of several statements most describes him or herself. Reliability is fair. There is no information on validity. There is a little help with interpretation, but not much information for school applications. A *Buros' review* (8:1184) indicates that little work has been done on the instrument since the initial development in 1957. Because of the age of the instrument and lack of validity studies it probably should not be used for routine decisions in the school.

**Substitutes for Leadership, S. Kerr (1978)** *Substitutes for Leadership: Their meaning and measurement. Organizational and Administrative Sciences*, 22, 375-403.

This is a scale designed to look at the context in which the administrator has to work. Context is thought to affect which leadership styles and traits will work best. It covers 13 areas of the environment that might modify a leader's ability to lead or that might modify the leadership style or traits that might be most effective. These areas include ability of the teachers, the clarity of the task and the flexibility of the organization. Teachers self-report on their own characteristics and then rate the environment on the context variables. Pitner and Charter (1984 --ED 251 941) present a factor analytic study that eliminates some of the items and reorganized the remaining 41 into 10 scales. Internal consistency reliability of the scales ranged from .60 to .85. Interrater reliabilities of school descriptions were low. They failed to find a relationship between conditions and best style. The authors recommend that more work be done on the instrument.

**Appendix C**

**Undocumented Instruments -- Short Reviews**

### **Undocumented Instruments -- Short Reviews**

The following instruments are included here because technical information was unavailable or non-existent. Most of the instruments are published in journals, research reports, or other sources.

**Administrator Management-By-Objectives Appraisal System (n.d.) by Raymond Bernabei.** Available in: *Developing a management system*, I.I. Banreb Associates, 541 Woodview Drive, Longwood, FL 32779.

This model is designed to help districts develop procedures to evaluate school administrators on objectives established by the administrator and supervisor and on daily job performance. It is a generic model of appraising performance. Sample objectives and rating forms are included. These are intended to be modified locally. One sample - Principal Performance Appraisal Instrument - has 5 areas and 41 ratings. A handbook includes sample job descriptions for several building and district level administrative positions. There is no reliability or validity information available. The model suggests two performance reviews and an annual evaluation of each administrator. Although it is time-consuming, it is a useful process to model for school districts which have no such procedure in place.

**Hanson Silver Management Style Inventory (1981).** J. Robert Hanson and Harvey F. Silver, Institute for Cognitive and Behavioral Studies, Box 402, Moorestown, NJ 08057.

The Hanson Silver Management Style Inventory is a 60-item self-report instrument. There are 15 sets of behaviors, each having a choice of 4 possible preferences. The respondent chooses the 1 or 2 preferences that most describe him or herself and indicates strength of preference by allocating 5 points between the 1 or 2 choices. The results are interpreted in terms of 4 decision-making styles based on Jung's theory of psychological types -- sensing-feeling, sensing-thinking, intuitive-thinking and intuitive-feeling. There is a fair amount of discussion of these styles but no way to compare one's scores to those of others. There is no information on reliability or validity.

**Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (LASI-Self, 1981) by Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard.** Available in: *So You Want to Know Your Leadership Style?*, Training and Development Journal, June 1981, pp 34-54.

This 12-item questionnaire may be used informally to assess a person's leadership in many situations (job, volunteer, parent). Leadership behavior is measured on a 3-dimensional grid: style (task or people orientation); style range (how many styles a person uses); and style adaptability (appropriate use of leadership style taking into account maturity of subordinates). There are forms for Subordinates and Peers to compare a supervisor's perception with the perceptions of others. The instrument was developed at the Center for Leadership Studies, Ohio State University. Technical information was not presented. There is help with interpretation.

**Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness (1982) by Daniel L. Duke.** Available in: *NASSP Bulletin*, 66, October 1982, pp 1-12.

The author presents a checklist of 42 items grouped in six functional areas to assess instructional leadership. The areas are: staff development, instructional support, resource acquisition and allocation, quality control,

coordination, and troubleshooting. The checklist presents specific things to look for to determine whether the leader is adequately fulfilling a function. No technical information is available.

**Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale (1967)** by F. E. Fiedler, in: *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, New York: McGraw-Hill.

This 18-item, self-report instrument attempts to categorize leadership style as being more relationship-motivated or task-motivated. The 18-items are sets of opposing adjectives. A person is asked to describe someone whom he or she least likes to work with, using these adjective pairs. There is no technical information. There is some assistance on interpreting results and some follow-up exercises to clarify results.

**Principal Leadership and Self-Appraisal of Effectiveness (1986)** by Anthony Miserandino. Available from: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 275 027, 11 pages.

This self-rating instrument is based on the research of Leithwood and Montgomery (1983), *A profile of growth in principal effectiveness*, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. There are four sets of behaviors: goal-setting, instructional/program activities, strategies for enhancing program development, and decision-making procedures. The 15 questions are meant to stimulate self-reflection and improvement. There is no reliability or validity information. There is some help with interpretation and use.

**Principals in Community Education Programs (1982)** by Jackson M. Drake and Brian P. Miller. Available in: *The Expanding Role of the Principal in the 1980s*, NASSP Bulletin, 66, October 1982, pp 18-26.

This checklist of twenty-five competency statements is used to describe 8 task areas essential for the minimal functions of the principal in relationship to community education. Task areas include: philosophy, goal setting and policy implementation; program development; program management; developing climate; personnel management; financial management; community relations; and program evaluation. There are one or two indicators listed for each competency. These help to provide criteria for knowing how to judge the competency. No other interpretation help is provided. The list of competencies was developed through a Delphi procedure. No technical information is available.

**Supervisory and Leadership Beliefs Questionnaire (1986)** by T. Venkateswara Rao. Available in: *The 1986 Annual: Developing Human Resources*, University Associates, 8517 Production Ave., San Diego, CA, 92121.

This self-rating instrument is not specific to educational settings and is recommended to be used for training purposes only. Administrators rate themselves on 3 sets of 3 statements. The results are interpreted in terms of 3 styles - benevolent, critical or self-dispensing. If only one style emerges, the manager is not flexible and may not be able to meet the different supervisory needs of subordinates. Only two research studies are reported using this instrument, both with small Ns (N=18 and 6). One showed stability of self-rating, the other showed consistency of rating between administrators and their subordinates. There is a fair amount of help with interpretation.

**Supervisory Attitudes: The X-Y Scale** (1972). Available in: **The 1972 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators**, J.W. Pfeiffer, and J. E. Jones, (editors), University Associates, 8517 Production Ave., San Diego, CA 92121.

This scale is used for self assessment in a training setting. It is based on Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y. There are 10 self-rating statements. These ratings are added up for an overall "crude" score which shows a predominance of one supervisory attitude. There are "lecturette" and group discussion questions to facilitate understanding of the overall score. It is intended for general use in business and industry. No technical information is provided.

**T-P Leadership Questionnaire** (1974). Available in: **A Handbook of Structured Experiences for Human Relations Training, Volume I (Revised)**, J. W. Pfeiffer, and J.E. Jones, (Editors), University Associates. 8517 Production Ave., San Diego, CA, 92121, pp 7-12.

This 35-item questionnaire is used to evaluate an individual's leadership style using the two dimensional task orientation/people orientation model. It is a self-rating instrument designed for use in training groups of leaders. It is not education-specific. There is no technical data available. There is some help with interpretation.

**Taking Your Leadership Temperature** (1982) by Bill Ernest. Available in: *Guidelines for Principals: Taking Your Leadership Temperature*, NASSP Bulletin, 66, October 1982, pp 13-17.

This four question instrument tries to quickly assess a principal's leadership style using the Managerial Grid model. A principal identifies one out of five statements for each of the 4 questions to describe his or her approach to planning, operations, "wrap up", and overall philosophy. Responses are coded for each of the managerial styles. No technical information is available.

**Appendix D**  
**State Activities and Resources**

## State Activities

Some instruments have been developed by state departments of education or professional organizations interested in school administrator evaluation. Below are descriptions of a few of these instruments or evaluation programs which are currently in place.

### Florida

**Targeted Selection**, Available from: Development Dimensions International, Development Dimensions Plaza, 1225 Washington Pike, P.O. Box 13379, Pittsburgh, PA 15243.

The Florida Council on Educational Management adopted **Targeted Selection** as an interview procedure for assessing essential leader competencies. DDI claims that employees hired through this procedure have significantly higher job performance and are promoted more quickly. We received no technical information, nor were we able to look at the interview protocol. A research report, *Examination Development in Educational Administration* (1987) by William H. Griffin and G. Michael Barry, Pensacola, FL: University of West Florida, reports some results with its use. One of its uses was to help in the development of the *Florida Educational Leadership Examination*. The instrument does require training. The sources listed also describe an entire leader evaluation system.

### Georgia

**Profile for Assessment of Leadership** (1984) Available from: Dekalb County School System, 955 North Indian Creek Drive, Clarkston, Georgia 30021.

This school administrator evaluation instrument assesses leadership in 8 competency areas including one experimental section (high expectations of staff and students). There are 99 items to be answered by information from the supervisor, the administrator, teachers, parents, and students. It is part of a complete evaluation system. We received no technical information.

### Hawaii

**Profiles of an Effective School/Educational Administrators** (1984) Available from: Department of Education, Office of Personnel Services, P. O. Box 2360, Honolulu, HI 96804

The Department of Education in Hawaii has a "School Administrator Evaluation Report" which is part of the overall administrator evaluation. There are four areas in the evaluation: commitment to school improvement; achievement-oriented and supportive leadership traits; unify staff, builds ownership and teamwork; and manages the full scope of school administrative responsibilities.

### Maine

**Maine Administrative Competency Survey** (1986) Available in: *Rational Analysis and Its Impact on the Definition of Administrator Competencies* (1987), by Suzanne Estler, University of Maine.

This survey was developed in response to the need for clear certification requirements in Maine. School administrators were asked questions in 5 areas: what administrative competencies do their jobs require; what levels of competencies do their jobs require; how is time used across jobs and levels; what are their training needs; and what delivery methods might meet those needs. The results of the survey will be used in developing competency requirements. The actual survey is not in the research report.

**Missouri**

**Performance Based Evaluation of School Superintendents (1986)** Available from:  
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Teacher Education and  
Certification, P. O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102.

In response to the *Excellence in Education Act of 1985*, school districts are required to develop performance based evaluation procedures for all administrators in four areas: educational leadership, district management, professional relationships, and professional responsibilities. The guidelines include three phases of evaluation: preparatory (goals and expectations); formative (observation, feedback, improvement targets); and summative (accomplishments, school board consensus). There are sample forms available for each of these phases.

## **Organizational Resources**

*ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.* University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the National Institute of Education. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Education Management contains research reports and journal articles on the topic of educational management. Searches of the ERIC database can be conducted via Dialog or BRS from most libraries, many ESDs and many state departments of education.

*National Association of Secondary School Principals.* 1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091. NASSP has provided leadership in alternative methods for assessing school administrators using the Assessment Center approach. The skills measured through this process are identified as necessary for successful school leadership.

*Project LEAD.* Rex Hagans, Director, Planning and Service Coordination, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 S.W. Main St., Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204, (800) 547-6339 (outside Oregon), (503) 275-9500.

Funded by state-level grants from the U.S. Department of Education, Project LEAD (Leadership in Educational Administration Development) is intended to improve the leadership skills of principals and superintendents around the country. LEAD projects seek to: (1) recruit good people into the profession, as well as provide in-service training; (2) broaden participation of women and minorities in educational administration; (3) emphasize a collegial and peer approach to training; (4) devise delivery systems to deal with geographic and other factors unique to each state; and (5) build strategies which will result in permanent support for the project after the anticipated six-year period of federal support.

## **Print Resources**

*Leadership.* Educational Testing Service Test Collection, 1985.

The 100 tests described in this bibliography measure leadership styles and leadership potential.

*Measures of Supervisory and Managerial Skills and Abilities.* Educational Testing Service Test Collection, July 1987.

This bibliography covers 150 tests which assess: managerial style, sensitivity, supervisory potential, knowledge or employee instruction and discipline, attitudes toward others, communications style, team membership, personality, stress, peer and employee perceptions of manager, verbal ability and reasoning ability. These measures are especially appropriate for screening candidates for a position.

*Mental Measurements Yearbook, 9th edition.* Edited by James E. Mitchell, Jr., Buros Institute for Mental Measurements, University of Nebraska Press, 1985.

This reference book is the latest in a series of two volume sets which contain lengthy scholarly reviews of tests. The score index is the best access point for finding leadership tests. Scores include indicators such as: leadership, leadership ability, and leadership behavior. A companion reference is *Tests In Print III* published by the same press and organized in a similar manner.

*Principal Selection Guide.* Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 1987.

This is an excellent resource for information on a general process to use to select principals. It also lists people knowledgeable about principal selection.

*New Directions in the professional development of school administrators: A synthesis and suggestions for improvement.* Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. A chapter from Approaches to Administrative Training, Albany, New York: State University Press of New York, 1987.

This chapter provides a description of various programs designed to train administrative skills.

*Test Critiques.* Edited by Daniel J. Keyser and Richard C. Sweetland, Test Corporation of America, 1984 - 1987.

This reference 6-volume reference work often contains measures not in *Mental Measurements Yearbook*. Tests found under "Management and Supervision" are the most appropriate for leadership. The companion volumes, *Tests: a comprehensive reference for assessment in psychology, education and business* and the *Supplement* provide quick information about the availability of instruments.

*Value Search --- Instructional Leadership.* ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403.

This is a listing of articles and papers from the Clearinghouse for the period January, 1982 to December, 1986. It contains a variety of references to information on training programs, skills lists and case studies of effective principals.

**Appendix E**  
**Summary Table of Leadership Instruments**

INSTRUMENT	FOCUS	TYPE	NO. FORMS	NO. LEVELS	NO. ITEMS	NO. SUBSCALES
<b>EDUCATION SPECIFIC</b>						
Administrator Perceiver Interview (1979)	Administrator functions, rapport with staff, effect on school climate	Interview	1	1	70	0
Leadership Skills Inventory (1985)	Age 10 to adult; administration and leadership skills and traits	Self-report	1	1	125	9
NASSP Assessment Center (1985)	Administration & leadership skills, traits of K-12 principals	Performance	1	1	N/A	12
<b>GENERAL ACROSS BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY</b>						
Human Resources Development Report (1987)	Leadership Style and Traits	Self-report	1	1	187	5
Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (1963)	Leadership Styles- Consideration and Initiating Structure	Self-report Subordinate- report	1	1	Varies depending on version	2
Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (1969)	Leadership Styles- Consideration and Structure	Self-report	1	1	40	2
Managerial Philosophies Scale (1986)	Leadership Style- Theory X & Y	Self-report	1	1	36	2
Myers-Briggs (1983)	Leadership Style	Self-report Personality	1	1	126	N/A
Nelson-Valenti Self-Scoring Survey of Education Leadership (1979)	Leadership Style- Bureaucratic, Technocratic, Idiocratic, Democratic	Self-report	1	1	50	18
Situational Leadership (1979-82)	Leadership Style- Match to Employee Needs- Consideration and Initiative Structure	Self-report Subordinate- report Observation	1	1	6 tests	?

ADM. TIME	SCORING	(1) SCORE INTERP	(2)	(3)	AVAILABILITY
			RELIABILITY	VALIDITY	
60 min	Hand- Requires trained interviewers	Fair-Good Requires trained interviewers	Good	Fair-Good	Selection Research, Inc PO Box 5700 Lincoln, NB 68505
45 min	Hand	Fair	Good-Excellent	Fair-Good	D.O.K. Publishers PO Box 605 East Aurora, NY 14052
2 days	Hand- Requires trained observers	Excellent Requires trained observers	Excellent	Fair-Good	NASSP 1904 Associate Drive Reston VA 22091
45 min	Machine	Excellent	Fair-Good	Good	Institute for Personality and Ability Testing PO Box 188 Champaign IL 61820
?	Hand	Poor	Not Given	Good	Neal, K. The relationship between human communication, functional dominance and the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure. (1982) ED 251 862
15 min	Hand	Fair-Good	Good	Good	SRA Inc. 155 N. Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60606
?	Hand	Fair	Good	Fair	Teleometrics International 1753 Woodstead Court The Woodlands, TX 77380
60 min	Hand Machine	Good	Fair-Good	Good	Consulting Psychologists Press 577 College Ave. Palo Alto, CA 94306
30-45 in	Hand	Fair- Good	Fair- Good	Good	Management Research Assoc RR 26, Box 26 Terre Haute, IN 47802
?	Hand	Fair	Not given	None Given	University Associates Inc. 8517 Production Avenue San Diego, CA 92121

INSTRUMENT	FOCUS	TYPE	NO. FORMS	NO. LEVELS	NO. ITEMS	NO. SUBSCALES
Styles of Leadership Survey (1986)	Leadership Styles- Directive, Supportive, Bureaucratic, Compromise, Integrated	Self-report	1	1	60	0
Styles of Management Inventory (1986)	Management Style Directive, Supportive, Bureaucratic, Compromise, Integrated	Self-report	1	1	60	0
XYZ Inventory (1975)	Leadership Style- Theory X, Y & Z	Self-report	1	1	42	0

#### RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

Administrator Professional Leadership Scale (1974)	Principal leadership effectiveness	Subordinate Questionnaire	1	1	18	3
Humanistic Leadership Scale (1981)	Principal Leadership Style- Humanism	Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	52	4
Instructional Activities Questionnaire (1984)	Principal Instruc. Functions	Teacher & Principal Rating	1	1	32	6
Leader Authenticity Scale (1982)	Principal Authencity	Subordinate Questionnaire	1	1	35	0
Leadership/Climate Inventory (1985)	Principal Effectiveness	Subordinate Questionnaire	1	1	82	8
Management Behavior Survey (1981)	General Management Function & Style	Subordinate Questionnaire	1	1	115	14
Management Opinionnaire (1980)	Superintendent Management Sty' -Theory X,Y & Administrative Grid	Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	27	?

ADM. TIME	SCORING	(1) SCORE INTERP	(2) RELIABILITY	(3) VALIDITY	AVAILABILITY
?	Hand	Fair	Fair	Fair	Teleometrics International 1755 Woodstead Court The Woodlands, TX 77380
?	Hand	Fair	Fair	Fair	Teleometrics International 1755 Woodstead Court The Woodlands, TX 77380
10-20 min	Hand Machine	Fair	Poor-Fair	None	Organisational Tests, Ltd Box 328 Fredericton, New Brunswick CANADA
?	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Fair	Bruce Thompson, Refinement of the Administrator Professional Leadership Scale ERIC ED 175-911
?	Hand	Fair	Not given	Not given	C. Eagleton and R. Cogdell The Humanistic Leadership model: A pilot investigation <u>Ed.Res.Quarterly</u> , 5, 1981, 51-70
?	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Fair	Terry Larsen University of Colorado Boulder, Colorado
?	Hand	Fair	Excellent	Good	James Henderson and Wayne Hoy, Leader Authenticity: The development and test of an operational measure. ERIC ED 219-408
?	Hand	Fair	Excellent	Fair	P. Watson, J. Crawford and G. Kimball. The school makes a difference: Analysis of teacher perceptions of their principal and school climate ERIC ED 266-529
?	Hand	Fair	Poor- Good	Fair	Gary Yukl, Leadership in Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981. Also in N. Pithers and W.W. Charter, Principal influence on teacher behavior. Substitutes for leadership ERIC ED 251-941
?	Hand	Fair	Good	Not given	W.E. Sistrunk and S.R. Jenkins. The preferred leadership style of school superintendents ERIC ED 197-430

INSTRUMENT	FOCUS	TYPE	No. FORMS	No. LEVELS	No. ITEMS	No. SUBSCALES
Organizational Climate Survey (1981)	Principal Function	Subordinate Questionnaire	1	1	50	8
Principal leadership Power Profile (1987)	Principal Leadership Style	Performance	1	1	N/A	4
The RAD Scales (1957)	General Management Function	Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	48	6
Substitutes for Leadership (1978)	Characteristics of environment that might affect ability to lead	Teacher Questionnaire	1	1	41	10

#### UNDOCUMENTED INSTRUMENTS

Administrator Management by Objectives Appraisal System (nd)	Administrator Functions	Observational Checklist	N/A	N/A	This is really a process by which districts can set up their own appraisal systems Sample instruments are included	
Hanson-Silver Management Style Style Inventory (1981)	Decision-making Style	Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	60	0
Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory (1981)	General Leadership Style	Subordinate & Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	12	3
Leadership Functions & Instructional Effectiveness (1982)	Principal Functions	Observer Questionnaire	1	1	42	6
Least Preferred Coworker Scale (1987)	General Leadership Style	Self-rate Questionnaire	1	1	18	0

ADM. TIME	SCORING	(1) SCORE INTERP	(2) RELIABILITY	(3) VALIDITY	AVAILABILITY
?	Machine	Good	Good	Fair	Donald Coleman, Leader style assessment, ERIC ED 202-150
?	Hand	Requires Trained Personnel	Fair- Good	Fair	P.R. Krysinski,et.al. Assessing Leadership Qualities of School Principals...AERA, 1987 (should be in ERIC soon)
?	Hand	Fair	Fair	Fair but old	Bureau of Business Research Ohio State University
?	Hand	Fair	Poor- Good	Not Given	S. Kerr. Substitutes for leadership. Their meaning & measurement, <u>Organizational and Administrative Sciences</u> , 22, 1978, 3/5-403. Also in Pither & Charter, ERIC ED 251-941
?	Hand	Poor	Not Given	Not Given	Developing a management system I.E. Banreb Associates 541 Woodview Drive Longwood, FL 32779
?	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Not Given	J.R. Hanson and H.F. Silver, Institute for Cognitive and Behavioral Studies, Box 402, Moorestown, NJ 08057
?	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Not Given	P. Hersey & K.H. Blanchard So You Want to Know your Leadership Style? <u>Training</u> <u>and Development Journal</u> , 1981, pp 34-54
?	Hand	Poor	Not Given	Not Given	D. Duke, Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness <u>NASSP Bulletin</u> , 66 October 1982, pp 1-12
?	Hand	Good	Not Given	Not Given	F.E. Fiedler <u>A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness</u> , NY, McGraw-Hill, 1967

INSTRUMENT	FOCUS	TYPE	NO. FORMS	NO. LEVELS	NO. ITEMS	NO. SUBSCALES
Principal Leadership & Self-Appraisal of Effectiveness (1986)	Principal Functions	Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	15	4
Principals In Community Education Programs (1982)	Principal Functions	Self-report Checklist	1	1	25	8
Supervisory and Leadership Beliefs Questionnaire (1986)	General Leadership Style	Self-rating Questionnaire	1	1	9	0
Supervisory Attitudes The X-Y Scale (1972)	General Leadership Style	Self-rating Questionnaire	1	1	10	0
T-P Leadership Questionnaire (1974)	General Leadership Style	Self-rating Questionnaire	1	1	35	2
Taking Your Leadership Temperature (1982)	Principal Leadership Style	Self-rating Questionnaire	1	1	4	0

#### OTHER PUBLISHED INSTRUMENTS

Multiple Management Styles Inventory (1986)	General Management Style	Self-report Questionnaire	1	1	50	0
---	--------------------------	---------------------------	---	---	----	---

Profile of a School: Staff Questionnaire (1986)	School Administrator	Student Staff, Parent, School	1 of each	1 of each	?	?
	Style-Authoritarian, Benevolent-	Effectiveness	Board & Supr.			
	Authoritarian	Questionnaires				
	Consultative or Participative					

#### CRITERIA FOR RATINGS

Score Interpretation	Reliability	Validity
P = No help	P = .60 or less	P = None
F = Some Help	F = .61-.75	F = At least 1 study
G = Several interpretative approaches	G = .75-.90	G = Several studies
E = Help with both interpretation and how to change behavior	E = .90+	E = Extensive study

ADM. TIME	SCORING	(1) SCORE INTERP	(2) RELIABILITY	(3) VALIDITY	AVAILABILITY
?	Hand	Hand	Not Given	Not Given	A. Miserandino (1986) Principal leadership and self-appraisal of effectiveness. ERIC Reproduction Service, ED 275 027.
?	Hand	Poor	Not Given	Not Given	J.M. Drake & B P Miller The Expanding Role of the Principal in the 80's <u>NASSP Bulletin</u> , October 1982, pp 18-26
5 min	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Not Given	1986 Annual: Developing Human Resources, University Associates 8517 Production Ave., San Diego, CA 92121
?	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Not Given	J.W. Pfeiffer & J.E. Jones The 1972 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators, University Associates, 8517 Production Ave., San Diego, CA 92121
45 min	Hand	Fair	Not Given	Not Given	J.W. Pfeiffer & J.E. Jones The 1972 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators, University Associates, 8517 Production Ave., San Diego, CA 92121
?	Hand	Poor	Not Given	Not Given	B. Ernest. Guidelines for Principals: Taking Your Leadership Temperature <u>NASSP Bulletin</u> , October 1982, pp 13-17
?	Hand	Poor*	Not* Given	Not* Given	A.W. Smith, Texas A&M A.W.S. Associates 3710 Stillmeadow Bryan, TX 77802
?	?	Poor*	Not* reviewed	Not* reviewed	Rensis Likert Associates Wolverine Tower 3001 S. State St.- Suite 401 Ann Arbor, MI 48108

\*More information may be available from the author

**Appendix F**

**Checklist for Selecting a Measure of Leadership**

## **Checklist for Selecting a Measure of Leadership**

### **I. Usefulness**

- A. Do the stated uses of the instrument match up with what you want to use the information for? Some uses might include personnel selection, advancement, career development, informal self-evaluation and training. Remember that there should be evidence that the instrument can be used for the stated purpose.
- B. Does the instrument or procedure assist with interpretation of results? Does it specify what profile of scores is "good" or "bad"? Is there evidence that a "good" profile is related to outcome? Are there norms?
- C. If an area shows a weakness on the part of the principal, is there help with what to do about it? Suggestions for training?
- D. Is the instrument or method easy to use? Easy to score and interpret? Remember that the best instruments may be performance oriented and so may require outside expertise.
- E. Is the procedure or test within acceptable bounds for administration time and cost? Remember that the best instruments may be performance oriented and so may be time-consuming and costly.

### **II. Technical Adequacy**

#### **A. Reliability**

1. Was the instrument or procedure pilot-tested?
2. What varieties of reliability estimates are available for the instrument and what are the values? Varieties include internal consistency, test-retest and interrater (for procedures that require observation). The more important the use of the instrument or procedure the higher the values need to be. For personnel selection or promotion decisions the reliability should be above .90. For group or informal uses the reliabilities should be above .75.

#### **B. Validity. For important decisions, there should be greater effort at determining validity.**

1. Theoretical basis of the instrument. Do the supporting materials for the instrument or procedure provide a clear definition of leadership and a research-based rationale for the content of the instrument?
2. Is there evidence that the content actually does measure what it claims to?
  - a. Does it actually have the dimensional structure described by the subscales? This usually determined by factor analysis.
  - b. To what extent can examinees "fake good"?
  - c. Is there evidence that it is a measure of leadership and not general intelligence or verbal ability?

- d. How well does it relate to current effectiveness? What are the criteria for effectiveness -- teacher morale, student achievement, absenteeism, school climate, etc.?
- e. How well does it predict future effectiveness?
- f. Are groups that should be different in terms of scores actually different?
- g. Does the instrument register differences in scores after leadership training?
- h. Is it the opinion of knowledgeable judges that the instrument measures the constructs claimed?
- i. How do self-ratings correspond to the ratings of others?

**Inde**

69

## INDEX

- Administrator Management-By-Objectives Appraisal System**, 53  
**Administrator Perceiver Interview** (1979), 15  
**Administrator Professional Leadership Scale** (1974), 47  
**Hanson Silver Management Style Inventory** (1981), 53  
**Human Resource Development Report** (1987)  
    Based on the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (1978), 25  
**Humanistic Leadership Questionnaire** (1981), 47  
**Instructional Activity Questionnaire** (1984), 47  
**Leader Adaptability and Style Inventory** (1981), 53  
**Leader Authenticity Scale** (1982), 48  
**Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire** (1963), 27  
**Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness** (1982), 53  
**Leadership Opinion Questionnaire** (1969), 29  
**Leadership Skills Inventory** (1985), 18  
**Leadership/Climate Inventory** (1985), 48  
**Least Preferred Co-Worker Scale** (1967), 54  
**Maine Administrative Competency Survey** (1986), 59  
**Management Behavior Survey** (1981), 48  
**Management Opinionnaire** (1980), 49  
**Managerial Philosophies Scale** (1986), 31  
**Meyers-Briggs Type Indicator**, (1983), 32  
**Multiple Management Styles Inventory** (1986), 43  
**NASSP Assessment Centers** (1985), 20  
**Organizational Climate Survey** (1981), 49  
**Performance Based Evaluation of School Superintendents** (1986), 60  
**Principal Leadership and Self-Appraisal of Effectiveness** (1986), 54  
**Principal Leadership Power Profile** (1987), 49  
**Principals in Community Education Programs** (1982), 54  
**Profile for Assessment of Leadership** (1964), 59  
**Profile of a School** (1986), 43  
**Profiles of an Effective School/Educational Administrators** (1984), 59  
**Self-Scoring Survey of Educational Leadership** (1979), 34  
**Situational Leadership Instrument Package**, 36  
**Styles of Leadership Survey** (1986), 37  
**Styles of Management Inventory** (1986), 38  
**Substitutes for Leadership** (1978), 50  
**Supervisory and Leadership Beliefs Questionnaire** (1986), 54  
**Supervisory Attitudes: The X-Y Scale** (1972), 55  
**T-P Leadership Questionnaire** (1974), 55  
**Taking Your Leadership Temperature** (1982), 55  
**Targeted Selection**, 59  
**The Interaction Influence Analysis** (1980), 36  
**The Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD)** (1973), 36  
**The Leadership Appraisal Survey**, 37  
**The Leadership Scale** (1980), 36  
**The Management Appraisal Survey**, 38  
**The Power Perception Profile** (1987), 36  
**The Problem-Solving, Decision-Making Style Inventory** (1982), 36  
**The RAD Scales**, 50  
**The Readiness Scale** (1987), 36  
**XYZ Inventory** (1975), 39